

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In paragraph 1, on page 2 of the office action, the examiner states, "This office Action is taken in response to Applicants' Amendments and Remarks filed on November 29, 2006" As a matter of clarification, the applicant wishes to point out that the applicant's amendment was filed on 14 February, 2007, as indicated by the examiner on the "Office Action Summary" sheet.

In paragraph 3 of the office action, the examiner states: "Applicants' amendments and remarks have been fully and carefully considered. In response, a new ground of claim analysis based on a newly identified reference (Romine, US 6,442,604) has been made."

In paragraph 5 of the office action, the examiner states: "Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-19, 22-26 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Romine (US 6,442,604)."

In paragraph 7 of the office action, the examiner states: "Claims 5 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Romine (US 6,442,604), and in view of Matsuda et al. (U.S. 7,020,668)."

In paragraph 8 of the office action, the examiner states: "Claims 32-34 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Romine (US 6,442,604)."

In paragraph 9 of the office action, the examiner states, "Claims 20-21 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Romine (US 6,442,604), and in view of Idei et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0177330)."

In paragraph 10 of the office action, the examiner states, "Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Summary of this Amendment:

To expedite the allowance of this application, in this amendment the applicant has canceled all of the claims, except for claim 10, and the applicant submits that claim 10 is in a form the examiner stated would be allowable. As mentioned above, in paragraph 10 of the office action, the examiner states, "Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." The applicant wishes to point out that claim 10 was amended, in the preceding amendment filed on 2/14/07, to place claim 10 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, the applicant submits that claim 10 is in the form the examiner stated would be allowable.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the applicant respectfully requests entry of this amendment, which has been submitted to place this application in condition for allowance, to expedite allowance of the application. Specifically, in this amendment all of the claims have been canceled, except for claim 10, and claim 10 is presented herein in a form which the examiner stated would be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant submits that the application as amended herein is in condition for allowance, and requests allowance of the application. Any additional fees required in connection with this amendment that are not specifically provided for herewith are authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 09-0466 in the name of International Business Machines Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Ellis

Timothy N. Ellis
Reg. No. 41,734
Attorney for Applicant
telephone (858)455-7977